

than his means will justify in view of the demands upon him for the support of his children.

After the filing of this answer no further steps appear to have been taken in the cause until the 28th of July, 1845, when a supplemental bill was filed, in which it was alleged that since the separation, which still continued, the complainant had several times sought a reconciliation, and offered again to live with her husband, but that such, her offers, had been repulsed and rejected by him, and that he has, for a considerable period, failed to supply her with the necessary support and maintenance, thereby rendering her dependent upon the benevolence of friends for subsistence, and that she has understood, and charges, that he has resolved and declared his purpose to withhold from her all support. This bill likewise reiterates the charge in the original bill, that the defendant was endeavoring, by fraudulent conveyances and transfers of his property, to prejudice and anticipate her claims upon him. That the defendant will neither permit her to live with him, nor while apart from him, and kept so apart by his own determination, afford the maintenance which, as her husband, he owes her, and the law exacts from him. This bill concludes with a prayer for alimony and general relief.

The answer was filed to this bill on the 16th of March, 1846, in which all its allegations are roundly denied.

A commission then issued, under which numerous depositions were taken, and much written evidence produced and filed. It may not be considered necessary, and would certainly occupy a great deal of time and space to refer particularly and in detail to this proof. It may be sufficient to say that it does not very clearly appear, which of these two parties was most to blame for the discord which marred their domestic happiness whilst they lived together as man and wife. That there were faults on both sides, and that each occasionally yielded too far to the dominion of temper and the spirit of dissension, seems to be quite apparent from an examination of the proof.

It seems, however, to the court, that three propositions of fact are sufficiently established by the evidence, and it will re-